

IRQ
327.567
JAW



481

b 15732320

IRAQ'S FOREIGN POLICY

HASHIM JAWAD

Ministry for Foreign Affairs
Public Relations Department

V Iraq 22

~~PRF~~ Irq. 22

IRQ

37567

JAW



IRAQ'S FOREIGN POLICY

HASHIM JAWAD

**Statement of H.E. Mr. Hashim Jawad, the
Minister of Foreign Affairs, to the XV Session of
the United Nations, at the Plenary Meeting of the
General Assembly on October 6, 1960**

Ministry for Foreign Affairs
Public Relations Department

Mr. President:

May I extend to you, Sir, our wholehearted and sincere felicitations on your election to your high office. We are confident that at the present critical moment of history when the eyes and the ears of the world are turned to the United Nations, your experience, wisdom and impartiality will be of valuable service to us in our deliberations.

Peoples all over the world have rejoiced at the admission to membership of the United Nations sixteen countries who have recently attained independence; fifteen from the African continent and the Republic of Syprus. The significance of this event and its many implications cannot escape the attention of those who are conscious of the trends of the modern evolution of nations — a pro-

cess which in recent decades has been growing in momentum as a result of the general awakening of peoples everywhere in the world.

The attainment of political independence by subjugated peoples, reflecting the basic aspirations of all those nations deprived of their national freedom, is an inevitable step to be followed by others in the course of the progress of human society towards higher levels of social and political existence. The existence of non-independent nations in the world today, and the efforts to perpetuate such a state by the use of force have been and will remain an important cause of conflict in the international community and basic factor in generating trouble and discord among the nations of the world.

It is, therefore, a matter of the highest importance for this Assembly of Nations in its quest for peace and justice in the world, to act immediately and collectively to remove this fundamental cause of conflict and to save the millions who still suffer the degradation of subjugation — a situation which, in recent history, has been one of the major causes of tension in the world.

Thus, the proposal of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union regarding the termination of colonialism and the immediate granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples is of the highest significance. At this critical moment in world history, with international

tensions mounting, the liberation of colonial and semi-colonial countries and peoples will greatly contribute to the removal of certain fundamental causes of conflict and contradiction in international society. National and individual freedom which has been and will remain one of the pillars of modern civilisation, and the moving force for progress in modern society, cannot be denied to any people or nation at a time when the unity and interdependence of all countries and peoples of the world is becoming a necessity for the survival of human civilisation. The perpetuation of colonial subjugation is moreover a flagrant denial of the concept of "one world", and an anachronism which obstructs the proper evolution of the international community towards its goals of peace and progress.

The rapid increase in the membership of the United Nations should not only be considered as a result of the attainment of independence by new nations, but also as an expression of a genuine desire on their part to join hands with other nations. It is also an expression of their genuine desire for strengthening this organisation so as to enable it to play its historical role in promoting international understanding and cooperation and to widen the area of peace and justice. The new and small states join this organisation because of their confidence in the ability of the United Nations to settle international problems, and to assist them in overcoming their difficulties and also to find their

proper place in the international community of free and equal nations. It will, therefore, be a sad disappointment to those nations when they come here to find some powers impeding the efforts of the United Nations to bring about a new world order in which the small countries will find security, the means for development and progress, and the achievement of complete independence in a world of equal and sovereign states.

The General Assembly of the United Nations meets again in an atmosphere of a "Divided World". Tension has been increasing since the end of the Second World War. National and international efforts within and outside this Organisation have failed to solve a number of the major issues dividing the world. Nevertheless the hopes of most members of the international community for the settlement of these issues remain centred around this Organisation. Experience has shown that in spite of all criticism of United Nations and its weaknesses, its presence is imperative and its support by all nations is a major historical necessity.

The great and chief objective of nations uniting in the United Nations and binding themselves by the Charter is the preservation of their identity and personality in a relationship conducive to the promotion of peace, justice and progress. Yet, not only have the last decade and a half witnessed an increase in tension, the prevalence of the cold war, and occasional armed conflict but also witnessed

a great increase of the possibilities of the destruction of human civilisation by general war. This situation derives from the contradictions inherent in a world which refuses to admit the growing forces of a revolution covering most phases of the material and cultural life of society, both in its national and international aspects. There is, moreover, no justification for ignoring the revolution of peoples everywhere against outdated systems of relationships between nations inherited from the past. Neither is there any justification for ignoring the role which the United Nations can play in paving the way for the settlement of the issues which divide the world, or in resorting to the use of force for that end.

It has become obvious in recent years that the problems we have been gathering here to discuss emanate from a number of contradictions, both conceptual and institutional. In the course of the last fifteen years the political and economic aspirations of the non-free nations have risen to high levels, and active movements for political emancipation have spread to all subjugated peoples. The whole world, with the exception of certain circles and vested interests, has become more aware of the need for recognising this revolution and its historic impact upon its present and future destiny. The world has also recognised the necessity of maintaining a machinery for the coordination of the interests of nations, and the peaceful settlement of

their differences. Thus, the United Nations was, in the words of the Secretary-General, an organic creation of the political situation facing our generation.

The responsibilities of the United Nations have grown considerably since the world's political problems became more numerous and complicated; the tasks of promoting a new international order have embraced a greater number of questions pertaining to peoples at different levels of development. While the United Nations was evolving as a concept and an institution, and while a new international order was in the process of being created, some powers were motivated in the international relations by considerations which are in certain ways inconsistent with the objectives of the United Nations Charter and the basic premises upon which the new world order was to be built, thus hindering the proper evolution of this organisation and aggravating certain problems of the world.

Nevertheless, we believe that in a period of increasing danger of war it is incumbent upon member states to rally to the support of the United Nations in order to prevent further deterioration of the international situation, to make of the United Nations an effective instrument for arresting the evil forces of war, and a centre for the peaceful settlement of international differences and disputes.

People everywhere were greatly disturbed by the way the Summit Conference and the Ten-Nation

Disarmament Committee failed to achieve the objectives for which they were organised. Thus, we come to this Fifteenth Session of the General Assembly with the sense that it will be a crucial Session, that the United Nations will be facing a crisis of confidence, and that it will be the supreme duty of those nations who believe in the necessity of averting a catastrophe to human civilisation to act rapidly and effectively to save the United Nations, to enable it to create the basis for understanding between the powers, and to make of it in the words of the Charter "a centre for harmonising the actions of nations in the attainment of common ends".

The fifteen years in the life of the United Nations have witnessed a greater split between East and West, and the gathering of power into two contending and hostile blocs, negotiating from positions of strength. However true the picture of the division of power in the world at the present time, the fact remains that the development of the two blocs has not reached the point of collision, as there still exists space separating them and which could be occupied by other powers. The time has come for the non-committed nations, and others who recently attained independence to hasten to occupy this space and to bridge the gap which separates East and West. We have in mind these States who follow the policy of positive neutrality and other nations of Asia, Africa and Latin-America.

As the Secretary-General states in the Introduction to his Annual Report "Who can deny that today the countries of Asia or the countries of Africa, acting in a common spirit, represent powerful elements in the international community, in their ways as important as any of the big powers, although lacking in their military and economic potential".

Although the eyes of the world are turned with anxiety to the deliberations at this Session of the General Assembly because of the alarming international trends which developed in recent months, especially between the big powers, nevertheless, world public opinion expects from this Session not to forget other problems which are contributing to the increase of tension in the world.

These problems include the denial of membership to the People's Republic of China in the United Nations; the continued occupation of West Irian by the Netherlands; the attempt for the separation of Mauritania from Morocco by France; the war in Algeria; and fighting in Oman; the Palestine Question; and the question of the Congo.

I do not intend to deal with all these problems in detail. We have already expressed our opinion on the problem of China's right to membership in the United Nations⁽¹⁾, and pointed out the unwise policy of preventing China from occupying her legitimate place in the United Nations. We strongly

(1) See p. 37

support the right of Indonesia in West Irian and we believe that its occupation by the Netherlands forces is disturbing the peace and endangering the security in South East Asia. We will have, on the separation by France of Mauritania from Morocco, the opportunity to expose the nature of the colonial game played there by France in order to keep that Moroccan territory under its domination.

Regarding the remaining problems, which fall in the midst of our region and which constitute a danger to its peace and security, I should like to deal with them in some detail. I should also like to refer to the Congo question.

THE QUESTION OF ALGERIA :

The Algerian war of liberation will soon enter its seventh year, and the destruction in men and materials has grown ever greater and wider. Thus the United Nations has before it once again this great tragedy to tackle. It is hardly necessary to explain either the unjust character of this war, or its far-reaching effects on the state of tension in the world. It is equally unnecessary to recall here the accepted principle of the Charter regarding the right of the Algerian people to self-determination, a right which has been endorsed by this General Assembly and recognised even by France. Despite all these facts, and the recognition by wide segments of public opinion in France itself, and

in the world at large, the war is being continued by France with increasing force and determination. In other words, while the General Assembly has been endeavouring to bring about a settlement through negotiations, the French Government has obstinately refused to yield either to the appeals of world public opinion represented by this Organisation, or to the requirements of the present world situation.

A year ago President de Gaulle spoke of self-determination for Algeria. His reputation as the only man in France able to make peace in Algeria secured his international prestige and led a majority of the members of the United Nations to renew its appeal for negotiations as the most appropriate means for the implementation of the right of self-determination. The nature of the position of General de Gaulle and the political forces which brought him to power as well as the kind of power equilibrium in France itself, led us to doubt the intentions behind his declared Algerian policy. Subsequent events confirmed our doubts; contacts and meetings have shown beyond any doubt that General de Gaulle did not mean what he said regarding self-determination for Algeria. He wanted nothing less than surrender. He has gone further to reveal the true character of his policy when he recently denounced the United Nations and its Charter. He declared in advance that any resolution of the General Assembly on Algeria will have no

effect on his policy and he cynically referred to this Organisation as the "so-called" United Nations. In view of this attitude, it is to be asked how much weight should be placed on the participation of France in the United Nations and its actions therein? This attitude no doubt reflects the policy pursued by France in the international field, and particularly vis-a-vis small nations.

It is time that this General Assembly take a more positive stand with regard to Algeria. We have all rejoiced to have among us fifteen African States, and the question has been on everybody's lips — Why not Algeria? There is another aspect to the question. We believe that peace in Algeria is an essential preliminary to the relations of the Arab States with France, and to a large extent with the West. It might be appropriate to draw attention here to the fact that the Algerian war emphasises the dependence of France on NATO in general and the United States of America in particular. Having concentrated in Algeria an army of nearly three quarters of a million men and having both material and diplomatic support from the countries of NATO, France is trying desperately to wipe out by sheer force the Algerian national liberation movement. These endeavours are doomed to failure, as the Free Republic of Algeria was born in the fire of battle, and the Algerian army, which is a people's army, is daily striking severe blows against the French forces. It is rather disturbing

to know that those same NATO powers who come here to preach peace and justice extend their material and political assistance to France to enable it to disturb the peace and to continue this war of extermination.

How futile and atrocious it is to continue on the road of error, especially at a time when the peace of the world is threatened. We believe that unless action is taken rapidly to terminate the Algerian War to the satisfaction of the Algerian people's aspirations, the war area may extend and the struggle will become more international.

General de Gaulle has disillusioned world public opinion, because France's war in Algeria is absolutely devoid of any idealism. On the contrary, French action in Algeria is an exaltation of war and destruction. Since when, we may ask, have war and torture been ideals of a civilised society?

The time has come for this Assembly to find a just and democratic solution for the Algerian question, a solution more realistic than previous recommendations. Negotiations have failed because of France's determination to suppress by force the right of Algerians to self-determination. It now falls upon the United Nations to work out a plan for the implementation of the principles of self-determination in Algeria. The Algerian Government guided by its genuine desire to end the war and by the principles of the Charter and according to law and justice, has suggested a way out by

means of a plebiscite to be carried under the supervision and control of the United Nations.

This proposal is a challenge both to the United Nations as an organisation, and to all powers seeking to promote peace and justice. The Algerian Government has repeatedly responded to the appeals of the United Nations for negotiations; but France refused to heed the recommendations of this Assembly. Let the United Nations assume now its role of peacemaker and promoter of freedom and justice. The proposal is practical, and its implementation will undoubtedly cover questions situated in both areas of war and peace. This is not only a challenge to the United Nations, but also an opportunity which has been offered at a time when the whole world and particularly the less-developed countries is seeking ways and means to strengthen this Organisation.

THE PALESTINE QUESTION:

Israel has been, for the last twelve years, a factor disturbing the peace in the region of the Middle East, and a cause for obstructing its normal development and progress; and the presence of one million Arab refugees has served as an annual reminder to the General Assembly of a much bigger problem, the Palestine problem.

Every year the Report of the Secretary-General contains a chapter on the Palestine Question deal-

ing with acts of aggression committed by Israel against neighbouring Arab States. Thus every year the Security Council has to intervene a number of times in order to stop Israel's military violations of the General Armistice Agreements. This aggressive and hostile attitude of Israel and its policy of expansion by military means have kept the Arab countries in a state of fear and turned the whole region of the Middle East into an area of perpetual instability. The Israeli policy of encouraging and financing Jewish immigration beyond the economic absorptive capacity of the country has amply demonstrated the expansionist intentions of Israel towards neighbouring Arab countries. Moreover, the ever-rising expenditure on armaments, and the training of men and women in increasing numbers for military service are part of Israel's preparation for aggression against its neighbours.

In view of these and other facts connected with the militarisation of Israel's economy, the Middle Eastern situation of an increasing instability should, therefore, be viewed in relation to both the presence of Israel in our region and in the light of the component parts of its policy of preparation for a war of aggression. This situation concerns no doubt not only the Arab peoples in the Middle East but, also the world at large. And it is, therefore, the responsibility of the United Nations to tackle the problem thus created, as the

security of the Middle East is daily becoming more intimately related to the question of general security in the world.

We feel, however, that the mere passing of resolutions by the Security Council, or even by the General Assembly, is not the appropriate way for dealing with Israel, which is bent on aggression and perpetuates its presence by the force of arms. Since its creation, Israel has followed an attitude of defiance to the decisions of the United Nations; it has ignored the directives of the Security Council, and has continually worked to ferment strife and conflict in the region. The reasons for this policy are not difficult to see.

Israeli militarism supported by certain political circles and groups with economic vested interests in Europe and America reflects the existence of closely knit relationships between Israel and those Western powers which count on maintaining their domination from positions of strength. Moreover, economic and financial aid generously provided to Israel by certain Western countries, particularly the United States and France, offer an irrefutable proof of the determination of those countries to make of Israel a stronghold against the Arab States. The special task assigned to Israel by certain Western Powers, particularly the United States and France, offer an irrefutable proof of the determination of those countries to make of Israel a stronghold against the Arab States. The special task assign-

ned to Israel by certain Western powers since its creation was divulged during the tripartite aggression against Egypt in 1956. Moreover, never a year has passed in which Israel has not committed a number of acts of aggression against the Arab countries, as it is evident from the records of the Security Council and those of the Armistice Commissions.

With the passage of time, it has become abundantly clear to most members of the United Nations that Israel constitutes the major factor of instability in the Middle East and an inherent danger to its security and that of world peace. Above all, Israel's presence and acts against the Arab countries have provided pretexts for the intervention of certain powers, and an excuse for exercising pressure thereupon. The events of the last twelve years have shown only too clearly that certain colonial powers have used Israel as a ground from which to exercise control over the liberated Arab States, and through which to employ pressure upon them and to threaten their independence. Thus certain Western powers, motivated by common imperialist interests, have systematically reinforced the economic and military position of Israel and provided it with the necessary political and diplomatic protection within and from outside the region. These powers consider Israel as their main military and strategic base in the Middle East, not only to perpetuate their influence in the region but

also for aggressive purposes outside it.

The conclusion to be derived from the preceding observations is that the strategy and tactics of the imperialist powers in the Middle East have centred around the presence of Israel. We who fought, and are still fighting the imperialist domination in our countries therefore view Israel not only as a usurper of our land, but also an instrument of oppression to our people and a continuous threat to our national freedom and independence. Furthermore, Israel, being an alien body in the Arab homeland, has no right whatsoever to continue to exist in the territories of the Arab East.

The situation of the Palestine Arab refugees during the last twelve years reveals clearly their determination not to accept the fait accompli imposed upon their homeland by an ill-considered, prejudicial and an extremely unjust decision of the United Nations. Today, more than ever, they are determined to 'regain their country Palestine; they are not alone in their determination, they have the whole Arab world behind them. Their right to do so stems from the injustices inflicted upon them by the United Nations' arbitrary action dictated by certain imperialist powers. Therefore, the question of Palestine is not settled, as nothing is really settled until it is settled right; and the only way to do so is that Palestine in its entirety should belong once more to its Arab population.

OMAN AND SOUTHERN ARABIA:

In another part of the Middle East, that is in Oman and Southern Arabia, the colonial system continues the operations of suppression by force, of the national liberation movements in order to perpetuate its control and supremacy established during the 19th century.

For the last five years the people of Oman have been in a state of revolt against their oppressors and have been fighting the British colonial occupation. Although the people of Oman possess neither the necessary arms nor the military organisation for prosecuting the war against the modern weapons of destruction employed by the forces of a big power, the British have not been able to defeat them or to gain a victory. This shows that a people fighting for a just cause — their liberation — can never be defeated by a colonial power, however strong.

And for five years the world has been prevented from knowing the tragedies of the war in Oman. The colonial powers and their friends barred the consideration of the question by the United Nations in 1957. Then a conspiracy of silence was organised by the occupying forces; visitors and correspondents of newspapers and world news agencies were not allowed to visit Oman or the adjacent territories.

Last year we appealed to the United Nations

from this tribune to initiate an inquiry into the existing conflict between the peoples of the South Arabian territories and Britain, as well as into the legal basis for the presence of Britain there. No response was ever heard to our appeal, the colonial conspiracy continued, and the United Nations remained indifferent.

Needless to say, the continuation of this United Nations attitude of indifference towards the subjugation of people by the colonial powers, and the suppression of their national demand by force is bound to lead to the weakening of the Organisation and to the spread of violence and lawlessness in the world.

THE CONGO QUESTION:

The situation in the Congo continues to cause great concern and anxiety. As we indicated in the debate during the recent Fourth Emergency Special Session, Belgium bears the major share of the responsibility for the deterioration of the situation. When the Belgians ended their colonial rule in the Congo, they left behind them a legacy of hate and fear. The people of the Congo were soon to find out that independence did not completely rid them of Belgian influence and intrigue.

The regrettable incidents which occurred soon after independence were provoked, no doubt, by the utter thoughtlessness and arrogance of the

Belgian officers in command of the *force publique*. This provided for Belgium a pretext to reimpose its authority in the Congo. Nowhere was the pattern more clear than in Katanga where a secessionist movement was instigated and fully supported by the Belgian Government. The representatives of Belgium have advanced the argument that if Belgium wanted to stay in the Congo it would not have granted that country independence. The answer to this assertion is very simple. The Belgians did not offer independence as a gift to the Congolese people, they were forced to do so under the gathering momentum of African nationalism. They realised that if they did not agree to grant independence to the Congo, they would be forced to do so later. So they gave what they had to give, but sought to perpetuate their economic hegemony separating the rich province of Katanga where most of the country's mineral wealth is located.

The present crisis in the Congo would never have reached this critical stage if Belgium did not try through secessionists to violate the unity, territorial integrity, and independence of the Congo. When President Kasavubu and Premier Lumumba addressed their joint appeal to the United Nations for help, the main problems which were facing the Congo at the time were the withdrawal of Belgian troops and the maintenance of internal peace and order. The crisis would have ended with the withdrawal of Belgian troops which was

effected under relentless pressure from the Secretary-General, acting in accordance with the mandate given to him by the Security Council. Unfortunately, the Belgians left behind them a time bomb which exploded, threatening not only the independence of the Congo and its territorial integrity, but world peace and security and the future of the United Nations itself. In retrospect and in view of its disastrous results, how irresponsible and narrow minded Belgian policy has been? The evil seed they planted in Katanga has poisoned the relations between the Congo Government and the United Nations endangering the very existence of this organization.

Our position regarding the Congo question is based upon the resolution adopted more than two weeks ago by the General Assembly. We co-sponsored that resolution together with all the African States who were members of this organization at that time. The 17 sponsors were supported fully by all the other member states from Asia and the resolution was adopted without a dissenting vote by the Assembly. The Congo question, however, is still with the General Assembly. What we have to do now is to find the appropriate means to bring about harmony and peace in the Congo and to safeguard its independence and territorial integrity. To achieve this end, the executive action is of primary importance and as Mr. Nehru said, "It would not be desirable for the executive to be

weakened when frequent and rapid decisions have to be made. That would mean an abdication of the responsibilities undertaken by the United Nations. If the executive itself is split up and pulls in different directions, it will not be able to function adequately or with speed. For that reason, the executive should be given authority to act within the terms of directions issued. At the same time, the executive has to keep in view all the time the impact of various forces in the world, for we must realise that unfortunately we live in a world where there are many pulls in different directions. The Secretary-General might well consider what organisational steps should be taken to deal adequately with this novel situation".

I would like to take this opportunity to associate myself with the wide expression of confidence in the ability of the Secretary-General, his impartiality and his devotion to the cause of peace and freedom everywhere.

POLITICO — ECONOMIC INDEPENDENCE OF NEW STATES:

The retreat of the colonial system and the growing aspirations of the peoples in the less-developed countries for economic development are among the most acute problems of our time. Apart from reflecting certain aspects of the present crisis of the capitalist system, these two facts represent

the basis which relate the political independence of the new states to their future economic development. Constant endeavours are made by certain powers to maintain their colonial domination in the economic field. Experience has shown that under such conditions the general problem of "under development" in the new states cannot be solved.

In these states people are struggling to find the shortest road which leads to a rapid achievement of a decent material and cultural existence, and to free themselves from colonial and semi-colonial relationships in their various forms. Therefore, the main objective of the new states is the achievement of complete political and economic independence, without which the problem of under-development cannot be solved. It should, however, be noted that political independence, which is the exercise of the right of separation, will be devoid of its essence if preliberation economic relationships will continue to operate between the colonial powers and the new states in their traditional institutional forms. That is why it is essential that the contents of political independence should be expressed in terms of economic relations between the new States and the former colonial powers. It is, therefore, imperative that the right of separation, which implies above all complete sovereignty of the new states over their internal and external affairs, should lead to the termination or the read-

justment of existing unequal economic relationships, and should open the way for the conclusion of a new and free association between the two parties. It is necessary to point out that the new association can hardly function if the colonial powers continue to be guided in their approach to the new States by old colonial conceptions and practices in the field of economic relations. Without free and equal economic association political independence will be fictitious and the new States will remain within the grip of the colonial regime. It is common knowledge that for colonialism political annexation of a country or a territory is not an end in itself; it is a means for its economic exploitation. On the other hand, economic exploitation can be achieved without political annexation. Thus the attainment of political independence by certain states will serve little purpose if the process of economic decolonisation is not attained in the light of the following two criteria of economic independence: the freedom to terminate the colonial pillage of the economic resources of the new States; and the freedom of the new states to choose their own ways and methods of economic development.

Experience has shown that the first requirement of economic development is change; and since change does not come easy, economic development has been a delicate and often a dangerous task. It requires above all greater understanding and collaboration on the international level.

The movement of the peoples of the economically less-developed countries along the road of economic development is hampered by certain well known obstacles. Most important of these are lack of investment capital, technical knowledge and qualified personnel.

In the great task of meeting these needs, we have strongly and consistently advocated the channelling of both capital and technical assistance to the less-developed countries through the United Nations. This position rests on two primary considerations. In the first place unlike bilateral aid, United Nations assistance does not arouse the political and psychological sensitivities of the recipient countries and is by its nature more closely related to their actual needs. On the other hand, if the basic principles and purposes of the Charter are to be fully implemented, this organisation must be provided with the means to play a major role in the rapid development of the less developed countries. We have, from the beginning, actively participated in and given our support to the United Nations programmes of technical assistance. We welcomed the establishment of the Special Fund as an enlargement of the scope of the United Nations programmes of assistance, and hope that the initial goal of \$100 million for the Expanded Programme and the Special Fund will soon be realised.

Important as they are, however, these programmes in our opinion are inadequate as bases

for a proper United Nations contribution to the economic development of less-developed countries. The growing necessity for the speedy establishment of the United Nations Capital Development Fund is one of the most important tasks still facing this organisation. We have recently heard a number of encouraging statements, particularly by the President of the United States, indicating that the principle underlying this long-standing demand has been accepted by some of the advanced countries previously opposed to the idea. May we hope that these statements will soon be translated into concrete action in the appropriate organs of the United Nations.

In the highly interdependent world of today a sustained and balanced rate of economic growth in the major industrial countries is not only essential to them, but is also of vital importance to the less-developed countries. Time and again attention has been called to the crucial problem of the constant fluctuation in the prices and volume of trade of the primary commodities which seriously affects the very foundations of the economies of these countries.

There are disturbing signs that the prices of hitherto stable commodities, such as petroleum, are being cut with serious consequence for those countries whose economies are largely dependent on the export of such commodities.

We believe the time has come for a fresh and

major effort to be made through the United Nations, to assist in curbing excessive fluctuations and to bring order into the international market of primary commodities. Unless this is done, no reasonable amount of outside aid to the underdeveloped countries can be truly effective.

DISARMAMENT AND PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE:

The Soviet proposal of 18 September, 1959, for general and complete disarmament received wide support in many parts of the world, because total disarmament was and remains the only possible and lasting solution for the political crisis of our era. The importance and the extreme urgency of the disarmament problem need no emphasis as the world finds itself at this moment at the edge of a precipice. It is, therefore, no exaggeration to say that the future of civilisation depends primarily on our ability to find a solution for the present arms race. In an epoch of rapid change like the present, characterised by great scientific and technological achievements, by revolutions and wars of liberation, by transition from capitalism to socialism in many parts of the world, and by great demands for economic and social development; in such an epoch the solution of the problem of armaments will usher the entry of man into an age of great prospects, while his failure will perhaps mark the end of civilisation.

The world today is at the cross-roads; and it is in the hands of this General Assembly to decide whether or not to accept war as an instrument for regulating relations between nations. But war as an instrument of policy is self defeating as war has become absurd and monstrous, and will definitely lead to the collapse of the world structure. Moreover, the acceptance of war as an instrument of foreign policy implies the maintenance of peace by the force of arms. Such peace will be based on fear arising from the balance of danger of the nuclear weapons. This is a faulty and dangerous conception, because fear can never provide a stable guarantee of peace. Nuclear weapons add greatly to the danger of "accidental" war; and in atmosphere of fear the risk is all the greater. Moreover, peace through fear is an unstable peace and signifies brinkmanship, wastful military expenditure and a permanent cold war.

The alternative to peace through fear, in our opinion, is peace through disarmament. That is why my Government supports the Soviet proposal for general and complete disarmament. The banning of nuclear weapons and complete and universal disarmament signify a step forward in providing a decisive condition for excluding war from the life of society, a fact which is bound to transform the entire system of international relations, abolish the law of force on which these relations are based, and provide new criteria of relations between na-

tions. In other words, if there is disarmament, international power will gradually cease to be measured in terms of military strength. A concept of right should then gradually replace the old principle of balance of power.

The fundamental issue in world politics today is the defence of peace. If the world is to face the problem of peace boldly — and that indeed is the only way to cope with the many problems which poison the relations between nations — it is bound to follow the policy of peaceful coexistence. The possibility of peaceful coexistence of states with different social and political systems has been confirmed in the inter-war period. The fact that the Second World War was not started between the capitalist and socialist countries, but between the capitalist countries themselves indicates the validity of the policy of peaceful coexistence. Since that time the contents of peaceful coexistence have become clearer and richer. It is not a temporary policy depending on circumstances, but a general line of development in international relations. It implies that war should be repudiated as a means for settling differences and disputes, and makes it incumbent on all states to observe the principle of non-interference in the affairs of nations. It implies moreover that the relations between big and small states should no longer be based on the principles of domination and subordination, of inequality, oppression and exploitation of the weak by the strong.

The implementation of these principles of peaceful coexistence leads to the consolidation of peace, to the establishment of international relations of a new type, relations that know no war and no violence. It will also lead to more active and broader relations of a constructive character.

Since the National Revolution of July 14, 1958, Iraq, under the guidance of its leader, Abdul Karim Kassim, has been following the road of positive neutrality in its relations with the various groups of powers in the world. Our foreign policy of neutrality is in essence a policy of peaceful coexistence. Thus with a spirit of neutrality and guided by the desire for peaceful co-operation with nations, our relations with states of different social and political systems have been developing favourably. Our policy of positive neutrality helped us to promote good relations with the East and the West, and with our neighbours and a number of other Asian and African States. In adopting a policy of peaceful co-existence, Iraq has been able to contribute to the combatting of the cold war and to set an example for small states to follow.

Last year I concluded my speech from this rostrum with a note of optimism reflecting the favourable and promising climate of international relations prevailing at the time. We deeply regret that the setback in East-West relations in recent months has confronted this Assembly and the world at large with a different atmosphere — an atmos-

phere of anxiety and crisis. We regret, but we do not despair.

The great dangers inherent in the present impasse, we believe, will serve as an impetus in our search for acceptable and more constructive solutions to the major issues dividing the world and threatening the very existence of human civilisation.

While listening to the important and sometimes dramatic statements made in this hall, it is a source of satisfaction to us, to hear the calm and clear voice of reason high above the commotion of tempers, complaints, accusations and counter accusations. We are confident that discords and recriminations are temporary, and that it is the voice of reason which will endure.

Of course it is not reasonable to expect that world problems, some inherited from the past, others newly created, can be settled in one session. There is, however, general agreement that the time has come for all of us, some more than others, to abandon some of our old ways of thinking and to adopt new norms for measuring our relations. There is a pressing need for us all to understand each other better, our ideas and ideals, our hopes and aspirations. Above all we need to recognize that the survival of human society depends primarily upon the degree of its respect for and attachment to the universal social and ethical values. Fifteen years ago at San Francisco the framers of the Char-

ter, guided by such values, pronounced to the world, in the preamble, certain universal principles; "to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security to ensure that armed forces shall not be used save in common interest to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples".

It is our fervent hope that these lofty principles will guide the United Nations in the search for a way out of the world's present dilemma.

**Statement of Mr. Hashim Jawad,
Minister for Foreign Affairs in the General
Assembly on the admission of the
People's Republic of China to the U.N.:**

In the opinion of my delegation the representation of China in the United Nations is a question of great importance. The number of States which recognize the Government of the People's Republic of China is ever increasing. It is the right of those States to have their opinions and views heard in the General Assembly, which is the natural forum where international problems are discussed. The democratic spirit which should prevail in the General Assembly must allow ample freedom for the discussion of international problems, particularly those of a controversial nature. It is precisely those controversial questions, rather than questions for which there is general support in this Assembly, that require study and discussion in order to arrive at the right solution.

The sharp division among the Members of the United Nations on the issue of Chinese representation should not deter us from fully discussing the problem. On the contrary, the fact that the question is controversial reinforces the reasons why the matter should be considered in the General Assembly. The General Committee recommended for inscription in the agenda many international disputes because it is considered, and rightly so, that their discussion in the assembly may contribute to their ultimate solution. The representation of China is a problem to which many Members attach great importance and for which an equitable solution must be quickly found. It is to be hoped, therefore, that even those States which do not share our opinion that the Government of the People's Republic of China is the legitimate representative of China will agree to discuss the question in this international body. It is the right of those holding opposing views to have an opportunity to express and defend their opinions in this world assembly.

There can be no justification for continuing a situation whereby the Government of the most populous country in the world, should, under the Charter, be denied the right of representing the great Chinese nation in this Organization. Are those who now claim to represent China in the Organization really in a position to discharge the responsibilities of a permanent member of the Security Council? Can they act as one of the great powers

having a primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security? Only the authority which is in actual control of that great country can carry out these responsibilities and obligations.

To avoid consideration of the question will seriously hurt the United Nations and impair the work of the major organs in which China holds a permanent seat. The fact that the social and political order of China has changed since it became a Member of the United Nations should not affect its international identity or its right of membership in the United Nations. Since the Charter came into effect, a number of countries have changed their social and political systems, but this change had no effect on their international status or their right to be represented in the United Nations. Vital questions affecting international peace and security, such as disarmament, cannot be fruitfully discussed in the United Nations without the active participation of the People's Republic of China, which, by virtue of its position and importance, can and does exert great influence on the course of world affairs. It is clearly not in the interests of the world to deny an important country like China the right to participate in the work of the United Nations. This Organization will greatly benefit from such participation, with the consequent obligation to abide by the Principles and Purposes of the Charter.

It is our sincere hope that the General Assembly will agree to the inscription of the question of the representation of China in the agenda of its fifteenth session. Persistence in opposing the discussion of this problem for political reasons is contrary to the democratic spirit which should prevail in an international Assembly and harmful to the United Nations itself; it constitutes a danger to world peace. The time has come to face realities and to end the unnatural situation that has existed for over ten years in this Organization.

For all these reasons my delegation supports the inscription of this item in the agenda and will therefore vote in favour of the amendment submitted by the representative of Nepal.

179

Printed at Ar-Rabita Press,
Baghdad, Iraq.